Docket No.: PRZYTULLA-22/15

Serial No.: 10/775,778

REMARKS

The last Office Action of January 9, 2006 has been carefully considered.

Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments

and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 [sic] are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 8 have been

amended. A total of 8 claims is now on file. No claim surcharge is due.

It is further noted that claims 1-7[sic] are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112,

second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and

distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, claims 1 and 8 were determined to lack proper antecedent basis for

the terms "the support area" and "all of the foregoing", respectively.

It is noted with appreciation that claims 1-7 were indicated allowable if

rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second

paragraph.

In this context it is noted that the Examiner allowed claims 1-7. However,

there are 8 claims in the application and claim 8 was referenced in the rejection

under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. It is therefore evident that the

Examiner meant to allow all 8 claims, which was confirmed by the Examiner's

supervisor Mr. McKay (phonetic), who was consulted on this issue.

5

Docket No.: PRZYTULLA-22/15

Serial No.: 10/775,778

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 8 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND

PARAGRAPH

In claim 1, applicant has changed the definite article to the indefinite article

in order to overcome the rejection.

In claim 8, the objected to language was eliminated and a more clear

expression used.

As a result of the amendment to claims 1 and 8, the rejection under

35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph becomes moot.

Withdrawal of the rejection of the claims 1 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112,

second paragraph is thus respectfully requested.

CITED REFERENCES

Applicant notes the prior art cited as of record and finds it without any

relevance to the claims that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that claims 1-8 as now on file are allowable.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully

requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes

anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully

6

Docket No.: PRZYTULLA-22/15

Serial No.: 10/775,778

requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-0502.

Respectfully submitted,

Ürsula B. Day

Attorney For Applicant

Reg. No: 47,296

Date: April 6, 2006

350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4714

New York, N.Y. 10118

(212)244-5500

UBD:be